	Case 5:08-cv-01507-HRL Document 4	Filed 03/28/08	Page 1 of 3
1			
2			
3			*E-filed 3/28/08*
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9	NOT FOR CITATION		
10	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
11	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
12	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
13			
14	N C 07 00050 HF	N C 07 000	050 HBI
15	No. C 07-00859 HR MARK HOUSTON,	L No. C 07-008	359 HKL
16	Plaintiff,		
17	V.		NYING WITHOUT E RELATED CASE MOTION
18	COUNTRY COACH, INC., Defendant.	r rejudic.	E RELATED CASE MOTION
19	Detendant.	/	
20	No. С 08-01507 J	IX/	
21	MARK HOUSTON,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
22	Plaintiff,	Re: Docket N	No. 50
23	v.		
24	GUARANTY RV, INC.,		
25	Defendant.	/	
26			
27	//		
28	//		

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

In the case currently pending before this court, Plaintiff moved under Civil L-R 3-12 for a determination of whether the instant action (Houston v. Country Coach, Inc., C07-00859) HRL) should be related to a later filed case (*Houston v. Guaranty RV, Inc.*, C08-01507 JW). Defendant Country Coach, Inc. opposed the motion.¹

In consideration of the issues and parties involved in both cases, it appears that they should be related. See Civil L-R 3-12(a). However, judicial economy will only be achieved if Defendant from the later filed case, Guaranty RV ("Guaranty"), consents to Magistrate Judge Jurisdiction. Since Guaranty has yet to enter an appearance in that action, a related case determination is premature.

Accordingly, the motion to relate these two cases is DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE. The court invites Plaintiff to bring this motion again if, once Guaranty appears, it consents to Magistrate Judge Jurisdiction.

C 07-00859 HRL Mark Houston v. Country Coach, Inc. C 08-01507 JW Houston -v- Guaranty RV, Inc.

I find that the above case SHOULD NOT, AT THIS TIME,

be related to the case assigned to me.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

20

Dated: 3/28/08

ED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

¹ The opposition was largely concerned with the prejudice to Country Coach should the case management schedules be consolidated. However, if the cases are related, this does not necessarily mean that they should or would be tried together. Rather, it is a determination that judicial economy would result from having these cases heard by the same judge.

Court	ornia
District C	District of Californi
States	For the Northern D
nted	For th

1	THIS SHALL CERTIFY THAT NOTICE WILL BE SENT TO:			
2 3	Terry L. Baker tbaker@consumerlawgroup.net			
4	Kevin J. Tully kevin@tullylaw.net, jeanine@tullylaw.net, julie@tullylaw.net			
5				
6	* Counsel are responsible for providing copies of this order to co-counsel who have not			
7	registered for e-filing.			
8	Date: 3/28/08 KRO			
9	Chambers of Magistrate Judge Howard R. Lloyd			
10				
11				
12				